

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Amendments touching the merits of this application made after final rejection may be admitted upon a showing of good and sufficient reasons why they are necessary and were not earlier presented. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.116(c). The amendments and arguments set forth herein are made in response to the Examiner's new rejections set forth in Paper No. 14. The amendments and arguments set forth herein place this application in condition for allowance and therefore should be entered.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-14 are pending in the application, with 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, and 11-14 being the independent claims. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 3-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese document JP 58-30851 ("the '851 document"). The Examiner states that the '851 document discloses all the features of claims 3-6. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent claim 3 calls for "the boom bracket being formed on its upper end with a pair of boom support portions and provided below each of the boom support portions with a hose guide hole; . . . wherein each of the operation oil hoses penetrates through each of the hose guide holes" (emphasis added). The '851 document shows two

boom support portions but only one hose guide hole, which is not below but is between the boom support portions through which the oil hoses penetrate. See '851 document, Figure 2. Accordingly, the '851 document fails to disclose each and every feature of claim 3. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 3.

Claims 4 and 5 depend from and add additional features to claim 3 and are allowable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 3. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 4 and 5.

Independent claim 6 calls for "a reinforcement member being plastered on a joint portion between the main body and the supported portion of the boom, wherein the reinforcement member is formed of a plate-like member which becomes thinner toward a tip end of the boom." The Examiner states that the '851 document shows a reinforcement member (the boom hydraulic cylinder supports). The boom hydraulic cylinder supports are not plastered on a joint portion between the main body and the supported portion of the boom 9. Rather, the boom hydraulic supports are part of boom bracket 8. The '851 document fails to disclose each and every feature of claim 6. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 6.

Claims 7, 8, and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Des. 309,313 to Takashima ("the Takashima patent"). The Examiner states that the Takashima patent discloses all the features of these claims. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent claim 7 calls for "end portion connectors of the oil hoses being arranged on the upper plate portion, . . . wherein end portions of the second plurality of operation oil hoses . . . are detachably connected to the respective end portion connectors of the first plurality of operation oil hoses." The Takashima patent discloses a plurality of oil hoses. See Figures 2, 3, 6 and 7. However, the Takashima patent fails to disclose a first plurality and a second plurality of operation oil hoses detachably connected via the end portion connectors arranged on the upper plate portion. Further, the Takashima patent fails to disclose any oil hose detachably connected to the respective end portion connector of any other oil hose. The Takashima patent thereby fails to disclose each and every feature of claim 7. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 7.

Independent claim 8 states that "the boom is provided on its rear surface between the brackets with a hose taking-out opening for pulling the operation oil hose from the inside of the boom to the outside through said pair of brackets" (emphasis added). The Takashima patent discloses a bracket on the rear surface of the boom. See Figure 3. However, the Takashima patent fails to disclose a hose taking-out opening between the brackets for taking out the operation oil hose. The Takashima patent thereby fails to disclose each and every feature of claim 8. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 8.

Independent claim 14 has been amended to include the feature "an arm fulcrum bracket fixed to the tip end portion of a main body of the boom, the arm fulcrum bracket including a main plate member, a reinforcement plate, the reinforcement plate being plastered on and contained within an inside surface of the projecting portion of the main

plate member." The Examiner states that the Takashima patent discloses an arm fulcrum bracket with a main plate member and a reinforcement plate. However, the reinforcement plate is not contained within an inside surface of the main plate member. See Figures 2, 6 and 7. The Takashima patent thereby fails to disclose each and every feature of claim 14. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 14.

Claims 1, 2, and 11-13 were allowed. Claims 9 and 10 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but otherwise allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 8 was distinguished over the art of record above. Accordingly, claims 9 and 10, which depend from claim 8, no longer depend upon a rejected base claim and thereby remain unchanged.

### ***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Tracy-Gene G. Durkin  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 32,831

Date: March 25, 2004

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600  
244305